1:Opler E-5 (1931-1937)1941
(ca. 1870) NT8 Eastern Apache NT8
Chiricahua

231 to four stout poles which are sunk into the ground. Inside, near the top, are perches on which the eaglets may rest.

An Eastern Chiricahua band leader had three eagles in one house. Then another was built. There were two in there. The little eagles used to go out and come back. They ate lungs. They fought like dogs. When they had had enough to eat, they went to the top. Eagles that are raised are never killed. After they have pulled the feathers off, they let them go.

One other informant recalled having seen eagles in captivity but sharply reduced the size of the cage employed from that pictured in the preceding account. The practice of capturing eaglets alive and raising them must be quite rare, however, for a number of other elderly commentators denied knowledge of it. One man explicitly stated: "We didn't keep eagles in a cage. Many were afraid of them and wouldn't touch them. We couldn't raise [361] them. We were moving all the time, staying three days or so in one place. That's why we stored our goods in cave caches."

226 262 It is possible that some individuals of the Southern Chiricahua band or members of some of its local groups make an attempt to secure fish and eat them:

My people eat fish. There was a certain river in Mexico where my people came. There they would lift rocks in the water and shoot the fish they found [252] there with arrows. When they were traveling they just put the fish on the coals and broiled them. They also used to boil them in water. They ate fish eggs, but they ate no shell fish at all.

Another informant, an Eastern Chiricahua who lived close to the Rio Grande, explained that those with whom he lived fished whenever they could and ate any kind of fish.

262 It may be, therefore, that the dislike of fish reported by many informants is to be correlated with unfamiliarity with this kind of food and the distance from any possible supply. The intensity of the repugnance and the willingness of many to equate the fish with the snake, suggest something stronger than mere unfamili- [177] arity, however. It is more likely that the Southwestern taboo on fish was beginning to influence the Chiricahua markedly and that the alleged similarity between the fish and the snake afforded a convenient rationalization.

In an attempt to explain why his people made so little use of fish a Chiricahua acquaintance said: